

LONG RANGE PLANNING

**TO:** Plan Review Steering Committee  
**FROM:** Long Range Planning Staff  
**DATE:** March 1, 2000  
**SUBJECT:** Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of  
February 16, 2000

**Attendance:**

Steering Committee Members:

Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member
Elizabeth Cerveney	City of La Center Mayor
Jay Cerveney	City of La Center Council Member
Dean Dossett	City of Camas Mayor
William Ganley	City of Battle Ground Mayor
Jeff Guard	City of Washougal Council Member
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Mary Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Jim Robertson	Town of Yacolt Mayor
Debi Smith	Town of Yacolt Council Member
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Tim Thompson	City of Ridgefield Mayor

Public:

Marnie Allen	Local school districts
Ken Hadley	Self
Lisa Hunter	Clark County Home Builders Association
Addison Jacobs	Responsible Growth Forum
Scott Patterson	Clark County Assoc. of Realtors
Elena "Laini" Risto	WVC

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Azam Babar	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Manager
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator

Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Mike Conway	City of Washougal Public Works Director
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Asst. Long Range Planning Manager
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioners' Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Dale Miller	Clark County Long Range Planning
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning, Senior Planner
Troy Rayburn	Clark County Board of Commissioners' Office
Elise Scolnick	Clark County Long Range Planning

## Introductions / Roll Call

Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

## Framework Plan Overview

Mr. Orjiako provided an overview of the current Community Framework Plan. This is a vision for the future that went beyond the 20-year comprehensive planning horizon. Three broad concepts were originally offered to the community: Country, Metropolitan, and Hometown. The Hometown concept was selected and eventually served as the basis for the Community Framework Plan. The current Comprehensive Growth Management Plan was, in turn, based in part upon the Community Framework Plan.

There are a few key goals, or pillars, within the current Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. One of which was a goal of a 60/40 ratio between the percentage of new single-family housing and multi-family housing. This is intended to apply to each jurisdiction so that each community absorbs a "fair share" of the higher density housing. The plan also intended to achieve a six to ten dwelling unit per acre net density.

The current *20-year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan* requires the county to publish a Plan Monitoring Report to track a variety of "key indicators".

Commissioner Morris asked if there had been a breakdown of acreage by general land use classification for the Community Framework Plan concepts. Mr. Orjiako responded that, no, the framework plan concepts were general in nature and were not taken down to that level of detail.

Commissioner Pridemore asked how far we can go in changing Community Framework Plan policies. Mr. Lowry responded that the policies can be amended through this update, but cautioned that such changes would likely have a ripple effect throughout the plan.

Commissioner Pridemore noted that the Steering Committee faced two challenges: funding the current plan (concurrency), and; recognizing that any significant changes to the plan will require significant effort, time and money.

## Hearings Board Issues

Mr. Lowry stated that the law requires the county to take action to get Capital Facilities Plan “back in sync” with the Comprehensive Plan within five years. That is, the Capital Facilities Plan must be internally consistent (i.e., either have a fundable capital facilities plan given the current land use plan, or if not doable, change the land use plan). There were three points on which he believes this process should focus:

1. Timing – Movement of the urban growth boundaries (UGB's) may not be considered until at least 75 percent of the residential and commercial land, or 50 percent of the industrial land, within the urban growth boundaries are developed. Consideration of urban growth boundary movement may occur no more frequently than every five years. The Plan Monitoring Report will identify the extent to which build-out has occurred.
2. Density—The 60/40 single-family/multi-family residential ratio mentioned earlier was altered in response to a remand from the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board. That remand dealt with the inadequacy of the smaller city plans/development regulations to achieve such goal. If we cannot achieve the planned densities we must consider many other options before concluding that urban growth boundaries should be moved.
3. Capital Facilities—Any movement of urban growth boundaries must be accompanied with a fundable capital facilities plan(s). The fatal flaw in the Growth Management Act is that there's not enough funding to pay for the capital facilities plans. Alternatives would be to change level-of-service standards (via concurrency ordinances) or to re-evaluate land use patterns.

Commissioner Morris posited a scenario where the inability to provide capital facilities and/or meet density requirements could effectively result in a moratorium in most, if not all, urban growth areas. Would there be any means of preempting rural development under such conditions?

Mr. Lowry indicated that there was another goal of encouraging about 80 percent of the new growth to occur in the urban areas (and about 20 percent in rural areas). He also indicated that conducting the vacant/buildable lands analysis in the rural area is not necessary to identify appropriate rural lot sizes.

Commissioner Morris noted there was a potential for housing an additional 35,000 people in the rural area.

Mr. Lowry stated that each city's comprehensive plan must provide for a variety of housing. The 60/40 residential split mentioned earlier was a goal and could be amended. He indicated the need for additional County Wide Planning Policies to deal with disputes and to enable appropriate reactions to future problems.

## Plan Monitoring Report Review

Commissioner Pridemore suggested the group skip its scheduled discussion of the Plan Monitoring Report until the 1999 statistics are available. Mr. Lee indicated staff was

currently verifying the comprehensive plan designations with each local jurisdiction. Staff has also begun analyzing the 1999 building permits.

Commissioner Morris asked if there were differences of opinion regarding what constitutes buildable land. Mr. Lee stated that staff has updated the critical lands coverages in response to concerns, but this resulted in only a 100 acre change within the Vancouver urban growth area. He also noted that there was agreement regarding the assumptions within the vacant/buildable lands analysis previously. Commissioner Morris indicated that it was important to have agreement on what's buildable.

Mr. Carson noted that staff was in the process of resolving outstanding discrepancies. Mr. Orjiako noted that the Plan Monitoring Report and efforts to comply with ESB 6094 are similar but different. Compliance with ESB 6094 is not required until 2002. Mr. Carson offered to produce and publish a "final draft" of the Plan Monitoring Report prior to finalizing the document. This would allow additional comments to be made by the public.

Commissioner Pridemore suggested that any remaining discrepancies over the monitoring report would be adjudicated by the Steering Committee.

### **Capital Facilities Plan Analysis**

Mr. Higbie passed out materials distributed to the Technical Advisory Committee last week that initiated the capital facilities analysis. Due to the time constraints, staff is pursuing a qualitative vs. quantitative approach at this time. The resulting data should be compiled by the end of March or early April. With that information available, the Steering Committee should be able to determine whether we can afford the current plans.

### **Public Information & Outreach**

Mr. Higbie discussed the effort to extensively use email for notification for future meetings. He noted that there had been additional public outreach recently as demonstrated by this afternoon's attendance.

Action—Council Member Burkman requested a copy of the current distribution lists be provided to members of the Steering Committee.

Commissioner Pridemore offered that a limited public outreach effort be pursued while the committee is engaged in technical background.

### **Meeting Locations**

The committee decided to alternate meetings between the county's planning offices and the CASEE center south of Battle Ground.

### **Scope of Review**

Commissioner Pridemore suggested that the committee needed to make some decisions about how extensive this review should be. Council Member Burkman

suggested the committee be conservative with changes due to the “ripple effect” discussed earlier.

**Adjourned**

The meeting adjourned about 6:10 p.m.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - feb 16 2000 .doc

D

R

A

F

T